



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,964	09/26/2005	Junbiao Zhang	PU030103	6118

24498 7590 02/06/2008  
Joseph J. Laks  
THOMSON LICENSING LLC  
2 Independence Way  
PO BOX 5312  
PRINCETON, NJ 08543

EXAMINER
----------

MITCHELL, NATHAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/06/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/550,964

Applicant(s)

ZHANG ET AL.

Examiner

Nathan Mitchell

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 13-17 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-6 and 10-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 3 and 7-9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0203771 A1 to Chang et al.

For claim 1, Chang et al. disclose a communication system comprising:

A gateway (50) connected to a wired network (see fig. 1 and paragraph 23)

A plurality of access points associated with and controlled by the gateway (20a/20p)

wherein each access point is configured to wireless communicate with and receive association requests from wireless clients for connection to the wired network through the access point (300) to send session information requests to the gateway in response to received association requests (302) and to process session information setting commands received from gateway (304)

wherein the gateway is configured to maintain session information that exists for each wireless client connected to the wired network through an access point associated with the gateway (302/304 and see abstract), the session information including a session key associated with each wireless client and an associated access point (table

1 authentication parameter and see paragraph 39. It can be considered a session key as it comes as session information. It can be considered to be associated with client and access point as it is used to secure communication) and to respond to a session information request from a given access point by providing that access point with currently existing session information if any maintained by the gateway for the wireless client requesting association with the access point (304).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. in view of 7,062,262 to Baird.

For claim 6, claim 1 discloses all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of reporting session data failure if session data does not exist.

However in an analogous art, Baird discloses reporting an error message if requested information is not found in a database (240). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine this teaching with that of Chang et al. by incorporating error handling into the gateway. The motivation for the combination is the use of a known technique to improve a similar device in the same way.

Claim 12 is rejected for essentially the same reason as claim 6 as it is considered implicit that the procedure of Chang et al. is implemented through a computer program. The invention as modified by Baird would subsequently use a computer program as well.

6. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0046179 A1 to Kokudo.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, with Chang et al. it is not clear that this extends to traffic between the access point and gateway. However Kokudo does teach encryption being using in communication between between an access point and a gateway (paragraph 32 lines 5-6 "encrypted gateway" implies communications between access point and gateway are encrypted). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of invention to encrypt transmissions between the access point and gateway. The motivation for doing this is to secure communications.

7. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. in view of Baird as applied to claim 6 and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0046179 A1 to Kokudo.

Regarding claims 10 and 11, with Chang et al. it is not clear that this extends to traffic between the access point and gateway. However Kokudo does teach encryption being using in communication between between an access point and a gateway (paragraph 32 lines 5-6 "encrypted gateway" implies communications between access point and gateway are encrypted). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to encrypt transmissions between the access point and gateway. The motivation for doing this is to secure communications.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Mitchell whose telephone number is (571)270-3117. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on (571)272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:  
10/550,964  
Art Unit: 2617

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*Nathan Mitchell*

Nathan Mitchell/nam

  
LESTER G. KINCAID  
SUPERVISOR/PAIR SYSTEMS